THE SEPARATE SCHOOL QUESTION

AND

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE

IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

REPORT OF THE SPEECH

DELIVERED BY

HON GEO. W. ROSS,

MINISTER OF EDUCATION,

On the Occasion of the Annual Demonstration of the Toronto Reform Association, June 29th, 1889.

Toronto:
HUNTER, ROSE & CO., PRINTERS.
1889.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOL QUESTION

AND

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE

IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

REPORT OF THE SPEECH

DELIVERED BY

HON GEO. W. ROSS,

MINISTER OF EDUCATION,

On the Occasion of the Annual Demonstration of the Toronto Reform Association, June 29th, 1889.

Toronto:
HUNTER, ROSE & CO., PRINTERS.
1889.

REPORT OF A SPEECH

DELIVERED BY

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION

AT THE

REFORM DEMONSTRATION,

Toronto, June 29th, 1889.

At the annual demonstration in connection with the Toronto Reform Association, held at the Exhibition grounds, on Saturday, June 29th, 1889, Sir Richard Cartwright, as Chairman, introduced the Minister of Education to an immense gathering of enthusiastic Reformers. When the hearty applause which greeted his appearance had subsided, Hon: G. W. Ross said :—

One of the greatest responsibilities resting upon the Government of the day is to submit annually for the approval of Parliament such legislation as will contribute to the development of the country, the better administration of justice and the promotion of public morality. In the discharge of this duty, the Government of which I have the honor to be a member has modified the municipal laws of the Province, the laws with respect to property and civil rights—in fact all the laws coming within the constitutional limitations of the Provincial Assembly. It has neither permitted a revolutionary radicalism to accelerate unduly the wheels of legislation, nor allowed slow-paced Conservatism to retard their progress. You may examine if you choose the Revised Statutes from beginning to end, and I venture to say you can scarcely find a single page that does not testify to the fact that the Government recognized its first duty to be to keep pace with the

GROWTH OF PUBLIC SENTIMENT

in everything that concerns the Province of Ontario. (Cheers.) Among the many questions with which we have to deal, perhaps there is none more perplexing or requiring a greater knowledge of details than educational questions. The constituency specially interested in legislation of this kind is often learned, sometimes finical, but always critical. Notwithstanding this we have been able, with some measure of success I trust, to make changes in the Public Schools Act, in the High Schools Act, and even in the University Act, which will prove beneficial to the Province. We believed it to be our duty, where the interests of education required it, to amend and improve these Acts. We saw no reason why legislation should not be progressive in educational as well as in other matters. (Cheers.) We were even vain enough to believe that the Separate Schools Act could be improved, that our Catholic fellow-citizens had not obtained perfection in the organisation of their schools any more than our Protestant fellow-citizens, and we flattered ourselves, after several years had passed and one or two elections had been fought and won without any criticism in regard to these changes, that they were acceptable to all classes of the community. Vain delusion! (Laughter.) While all parties, Protestant as well as Catholic, had accepted the changes made in the Acts respecting Public and High Schools as honestly intended to promote education, it is now charged that the changes made in the Separate Schools Act were prompted not by an educational but by a political motive. Our object was said to be not to improve the Separate Schools—that was above and beyond us altogether—our object was

TO CATCH THE CATHOLIC VOTE.

Now do not forget that we are not charged in this case with neglecting the educational interests of the children attending Separate Schools, or with injuring their mental growth, or with fostering wrong methods of teaching, but with angling for votes —with pandering to Roman Catholics. It is not charged that the Roman Catholics attending the Separate Schools do not receive a better education now than they did in '72. (Hear, hear.) If such a charge were made and sustained, then we certainly deserved to be driven from office. If we failed to provide for the 30,000 children attending the Separate Schools of Ontario as good an education as we have provided for those attending our Public Schools, we would have been guilty of a breach of public trust which not only Catholics but Protestants would resent, and that

in the most unmistakable way. The right to a good, thorough English education is recognized by the Constitution of the Province of Ontario as the birthright of every citizen, irrespective of creed, and, as I understand public sentiment, no Government could long exist that ignored, much less repudiated, this right. (Applause.) What are the charges in detail? First, it is said that under the Public Schools Act every ratepayer was presumably a Public School supporter; now because of our action, if such ratepayer be a Roman Catholic, he is presumably a Separate School supporter. Even if this presumption were true, it would only apply to municipalities in which Separate Schools are established, or to 193 out of a total of 710 municipalities in the Province. But let us see what the law is in this matter. If there were no Separate School in the municipality or within three miles of it, this part of the Assessor's duty would count for nothing. I am aware that the Public School Trustees of Toronto, who have shown such wonderful zeal in the maintenance of the Public School system, required the parents and guardians of children attending the city schools to sign a declaration

THAT THEY WERE PROTESTANTS,

and that their children were vaccinated before admitting them to the Public Schools of the city. (Laughter.) Whether the vaccination referred to meant inoculation with those high Tory principles which usually culminate in wordy declarations on the 12th of July and then subside into subserviency to the will of the chieftain on election day, I cannot say. (Cheers and laughter.) But the declaration is likely at all events to be withdrawn or modified as at once illegal and in direct violation of the letter and spirit of the School Act. The School Law never intended to divide and does not now divide the people of Ontario into two camps. Any division that takes place is still left to the free, unfettered choice of the parties concerned. (Hear, hear.) But what is the argument used by our opponents in this case? They say, quoting Section 48 of the Separate Schools Act, (1) "That the Assessors shall in the assessment roll set down the religion of the ratepayer, distinguishing between Catholic and Protestant, and whether a supporter of Public or Separate Schools, and (2) that the Assessor shall accept the statement of, or made on behalf of, any ratepayer that he is a Roman Catholic, as sufficient *prima facie* evidence for placing such person in the proper column of the assessment roll for Separate School supporter; and (3) if the Assessor knows personally any ratepayer to be a Roman Catholic, this shall be sufficient for placing him in such last mentioned column." And having quoted the statute as I have just done,

they say "Does not that prove our case to a demonstration?" Of course it does, if that is all the law says upon the question; but

WHAT ABOUT SECTION FORTY,

which requires a Roman Catholic to give notice to the Clerk of the Municipality on or before the 1st of March that he is a Separate School supporter, otherwise he must be rated as a Public School supporter? Is it possible to determine the whole law without giving force and effect to every section? Did you ever hear of a lawyer or a Judge construing the law in this way? Do theologians so construe the Holy Scriptures? Do juries give verdicts on the evidence of one witness only, or the simple statement standing alone of one witness? Is it not the universally accepted rule in construing statutes that the purpose or intent of the Legislature must be ascertained, not from one clause or one phrase, but from the statute as a whole? Now, if this rule be applied to the case before us there can be but one conclusion reached, and that is, unless the ratepayer gives the notice required by section 40, neither the act of the Assessor nor of the Clerk can compel him to pay rates for Separate School purposes. Speaking on this point in 1886, the Attorney-General, who is usually considered a good authority (cheers) said, "The preliminary notice has not been dispensed with; on the contrary, it has been expressly continued by the 41st (sec. 40, R. S. O., 87) section of the Act of last session, the section which gives Roman Catholics exemption from school rates; and any ratepayer of the municipality may object to the exemption before the Court of Revision on the ground that the necessary preliminary notice was not given, and he may do so without the consent and even contrary to the wish of the ratepayer whose case is in question." (Long continued applause.)

But what are the objections raised to this interpretation of the law—objections raised,

NOT BY LAWYERS NOR BY JUDGES,

who are the accredited interpreters of the law, but by the opponents of the Government? (1) They say that "if it were not intended that the assessment roll should be taken as the basis for levying the school rates, why require the Assessor to distinguish at all between Catholics and Protestants, between Separate and Public School supporters?" The answer to that is easy. By the Separate Schools Act of 1863, in addition to the notice to be given to the Clerk under section 40 of the Separate Schools Act (that is section 14 of the old Act), "the trustees of every Separate

School were required to transmit on or before the first day of June in each year a correct list of the names and residences of all persons supporting a Separate School under their management, and every ratepayer whose name shall not appear on such list shall be rated as a Public School supporter." In 1877 the Act was amended requiring the Assessor to enter upon the assessment roll the religion of each ratepayer, and the option was allowed Boards of Trustees of accepting the entries made by the Assessor in lieu of the list required by the Act of 1863. In 1879 it was further provided that where trustees availed themselves of the entries made by the Assessor, "the Assessor should accept the statement made by or on behalf of any ratepayer that he was a Roman Catholic, as *prima facie* evidence that such person was a Separate School supporter." The

REASON FOR THESE AMENDMENTS

is obvious. When the trustees made up the list they knew, of course, who were Catholics, and consequently who were likely to be Separate School supporters. The Assessor, if he possessed the same knowledge, was required to use it in the same way. By the consolidation of the statutes in 1886 trustees were relieved of the duty of sending to the Clerk annually a list of the supporters of that particular school, and the duty of making this report to the Clerk, which they were previously required to make, was withdrawn absolutely and transferred to the Assessor. Now, as the duty of the Assessor has been clearly substituted by the statutes for that of the trustees under the Act of 1863, it must have the same force—no more and no less—as the power conferred upon the trustees for which it has been so substituted. It follows, therefore, that as the individual ratepayer had to give notice under the old Act in addition to the notice given by the trustees, so the individual ratepayer must give notice now in addition to the entries made by the Assessor. In a city like Toronto, with perhaps 1000 ratepayers supporting the Separate Schools, it would be absurd to require the trustees

TO MAKE A LIST ANNUALLY

for the Clerk, particularly when a complete list was necessary, whether there were any additions during the year or not. (Hear, hear.)

But it is objected, secondly, that under the Act as it now stands any person may direct the Assessor to enter any ratepayer as a Separate School supporter, and that the Assessor is obliged to act upon that direction. The words of the statute are, "The Asses-

sor shall accept the statement of or made on behalf of, any ratepayer that he is a Roman Catholic as sufficient *prima facie* evidence for placing such person in the proper column of the assessment roll for Separate School supporters, etc." It is alleged that under this provision of the law many Roman Catholics who prefer the Public Schools are coerced by their clergy into supporting Separate Schools, and we are charged with being parties to this coercion. Mr. Chairman, I cannot undertake to say whether the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church are coercionists or not; I have no reason to think they are; neither can I undertake to say how far they control their people in matters of this kind. But I do say that if any ratepayer goes before the Court of Revision and asks for proof that any Catholic desires to become a Separate School supporter, and the proof is not forthcoming in the form of a notice from the Catholic himself or his agent (I am now quoting the Act of 1863, which in this respect has never be altered), then such Catholic cannot be assessed as a Separate School supporter. It is not a matter of assent or dissent or coercion. (Cheers.) It is purely a matter of law, and without notice or its equivalent the status of the ratepayer cannot be interfered with.

It is said, however, thirdly, that His Honor Judge Sinclair decided that certain Roman Catholic ratepayers of the Town of Dundas should pay their taxes to the Separate Schools although they had given no notice to the Clerk before the 1st of March, as required by statute. But on what principle was this decision based? These men had for two years allowed themselves without objection to be rated as Separate School supporters—they had acquiesced in the act of the Assessor, and Judge Sinclair held that acquiescence was equivalent to notice, and in so doing he simply recognized a principle of law by which you could forfeit your title to every square foot of real estate you own. Instead of setting aside our interpretation of the law, it

CONFIRMS IT, AS FAR AS IT GOES.

It therefore follows (1) that the law still presumes every ratepayer to be a Public School supporter; (2) that no man can become a Separate School supporter except by his own act or the act of his agent, and you must remember in this case that agency was allowed under the Act of 1863; (3) that the assessment roll does not bind the Court of Revision; (4) that the only evidence by which the status of a ratepayer who desires to become a Separate School supporter, or vice versa, can be absolutely determined is notice by himself or agent, or, if I accept Judge Sinclair's decision in the Dundas case, the equivalent of such notice; (5) that this case has been held to be the law by the Attorney-General,

whose authority as an exponent of the Constitution very few will question. (Cheers.)

It is said, next, that we provide by-laws for the representation of Roman Catholics on High School Boards, but make no provision for the representation of Methodists, Baptists or any other donomination. Now I want you to notice the disingenuous character of this objection. If we had denominational schools in Ontario as they have in England, the objection would be well taken. True, we have Protestant schools, whose claim might be similarly recognized, but they are in effect fully represented on all our High School Boards already. For some reason or other, which I have never yet seen fully explained, Municipal and County Councils

ALMOST ENTIRELY IGNORED ROMAN CATHOLICS

in their appointments to High School Boards The clergy of all other denominations were appointed over and over again; Protestant laymen of all denominations held seats on these Boards. Taxes were levied and collected from all alike. Out of 624 High School Trustees holding office in 1885, I have not been able to ascertain that even twenty of them were Catholics. Now, it was impossible that this apparent discrimination should not be felt, and that very keenly, by the Catholic supporters of High Schools. I do not charge my fellow-Protestants with bigotry in acting thus, but it was an oversight which the usual prudence of Municipal Councils failed to remedy. What was to be done? Under such treatment it was obvious that Catholics could not take the interest in higher education which it was desirable they should take. To be ostracised in the management of these schools was regarded by them as a notice that their children were not wanted there, and if the Government came to their rescue it did so only to repair the injustice from which they suffered. Sir, I do not regret this concession, if concession our opponents choose to call it. (Hear, hear.) I know it has stimulated the Separate Schools of the country to greater activity. I know it has

REMOVED A GRIEVANCE

which seriously impeded the cause of higher education. If you applauded those who fought for liberty on the ground that taxation without representation was unjust, you cannot condemn us for applying a similar principle at home and to your own fellow-subjects. (Cheers.) It will not do to say that a similar rule should be applied to Methodists and Presbyterians. When these denominations have schools of their own, it will be time enough to raise

that question. What we want now is the thorough education of all classes, Catholic as well as Protestant, and if the removal of this grievance will promote this end, as I believe it will, then we have in the results obtained the fullest justification of the wisdom of our course. (Applause.)

There are several other statements made by our opponents which I will not wait to argue. They are so clearly inaccurate, I will simply contradict them categorically. (1) It is not true, as sometimes alleged, that a Roman Catholic must, if he wishes to withdraw from a Separate School, notify the Clerk annually. One notice of withdrawal is sufficient, just as one notice to become a Separate School supporter is sufficient. It is not true that the law has been changed as to the time within which notice must be given. The second Wednesday in January and 1st of March are the dates fixed by the Act of 1863. It is not true the Assessor can enter any ratepayer as a Separate School supporter against his will. No man's will has been tampered with.

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARDS PUBLIC SCHOOLS,

as I trust toward every other interest with which we have to deal, is one of generous, yet judicial, fairness. We hope neither to punish nor favor any class of Her Majesty's subjects because of their religious opinions. We are the guardians of minorities just as well as of majorities, and what justice requires in either case we shall do, fully believing that the people of Ontario will vindicate our course. (Loud applause.)

Perhaps before dismissing this part of my subject it would be worth while inquiring, what is the secret of all this agitation against the Mowat Government on the Separate School question? Has it been shown that those for whom the Separate Schools are intended are suffering any cruel wrong at our hands? When you champion any cause you usually do so because some private right has been encroached upon. Have the privileges of any Roman Catholic been grievously assailed? True, it may have happened that here and there one or two Catholics have been wrongly assessed, or perhaps in one or two instances the rates of a Protestant have gone to a Separate School. But this is not the fault of the law. No human foresight can prevent officers from occasionally blundering. It would be unreasonable to suppose that where we have at least 500,000 ratepayers, over 700 clerks, and nearly 800 assessors, one or more of them would not make an occasional blunder. And yet, so far as I can learn from the press, public attention has been called to very few mistakes of this kind. Surely there is no reason for the outcry on this account. Or is it

because our Public Schools have been prejudiced by our so-called sympathy with Separate Schools? But where is the proof of this? Is it not a fact that our Public Schools were

NEVER MORE PROSPEROUS

than they are to-day; that every department of education, from the kindergarten to the University, throbs with increased vitality; that parents, trustees, teachers and inspectors are more active than ever they were in perfecting the education of the country? Nobody has suffered and therefore nobody has been wronged. (Hear, hear.) But even if we as Liberals were to blame for unduly favoring Separate Schools, how far can our opponents divest themselves of all responsibility? You cannot point to a single amendment to which objection was taken while they were passing through the Legislature. They were accepted by the Opposition in almost every instance without a single protest. In no case did they ask the House to divide upon them; but now, maddened and chafed by seventeen long years of political obscurity, they have become reckless enough to repudiate their own acts and pretend—and after all it is but a pretence—to be custodians of liberties, which, if sacrificed at all, were sacrificed in their presence and with their sanction. (Loud cheers.) This, sir, is the political warfare with which we have to contend; this the humiliation to which the great Conservative party

IS PREPARED TO SUBMIT

for a place on the Treasury benches. (Renewed cheers.)

I come next to consider that most disturbing of all questions—French and German schools—and I bracket these two because every objection that applies to one applies to the other. From an Anglo-Saxon standpoint they are both foreign languages, and national characteristics have very little to do with the question. In the first place I may be permitted to say that there appears to me to be a great deal of needless alarm about the so-called French invasion. So far as I have yet been able to learn, the

FRENCH PEOPLE IN EASTERN ONTARIO,

indeed everywhere, have not taken possession of the lands they occupy by violence; they have not with arquebus or rifle driven out the original settler and entered upon his estate without fee or reward. Their practice so far has been to buy the lands they occupy, and to pay for them the price agreed upon, and if they have multiplied in numbers and replenished that portion of the

earth they occupy, they have the sanction of a pretty high authority for so doing. (Laughter.) Even if they were as dangerous and obnoxious as they are represented to be, I think we have little to fear when we consider that according to last census they number only 143,743, the population of the whole Province being almost two millions. (Hear, hear.) The existence of French and German schools is not of recent origin. They were recognized by the old Council of Public Instruction in 1851, when teachers were allowed certificates on passing an examination in the French or German Grammar in lieu of English Grammar. Indeed, so liberally was this decision construed at that time that we find an instance in which the Board of Examiners for the County of Essex was directed on the advice of the Council of Public Instruction to grant a certificate to a teacher who was reported entirely ignorant of the English language. Further prominence was given to the use of both French and German in 1854 by the authorisation of certain text books in these languages, and in 1874 County Councils were authorised to appoint inspectors for every forty schools where the French language prevailed. Local superintendents in their reports to the Department make frequent reference to the French language as far back as 1854. I do not mention these matters to censure my predecessors. I am

MERELY STATING HISTORICAL FACTS.

In 1885 the first attempt was made by regulation to make the study of English compulsory by requiring the Public School readers to be used in every school. (Cheers.) A syllabus of a course in English was also prescribed requiring teachers to see that writing, spelling, composition and translation into English were also attended to in every French school. Now I am not going to say how far these regulations have been acted upon. I will leave any further observations on that point till I receive the report of the Commissioners appointed by the Department to inquire into this matter. Some newspapers have questioned my veracity in connection with this difficulty. I made no statement on my own authority, but on the authority of the local Inspectors for the counties in which French is spoken. I did state in the House last winter that English was taught in every school and that every teacher was capable of teaching English. I believed that statement to be true then and

I BELIEVE IT TO BE TRUE STILL.

At all events it has been confirmed by a return made by order of the House, which was printed a few weeks ago. (Cheers.) Now,

don't let it be supposed that I am satisfied with the progress made in this matter. I am hard to satisfy in many things. For instance, without disparaging anybody's work, I may say that I am not satisfied with the extent to which English is taught even in our High Schools and Universities. There is much to do in every department of study, but having begun this good work in our French schools, I may fairly claim the patient confidence of the public while I am still laboring for better results. (Applause.)

Now let me see how far we are agreed as to the remedy for the present condition of things. (1) I believe it to be my duty—as I stated in the House last winter in a general way, and I repeat the statement—to press steadily, prudently and reasonably for the

SAME PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH

in the schools of Ontario in which French and German are taught as in the Public Schools, where only English is taught. (Loud applause.) (2) To carry out at the earliest opportunity measures for training the teachers of French schools in correct methods of teaching English—(hear, hear)—as I proposed to do in 1886, but which I was unable to carry out from a want of qualified teachers. (3) Having introduced the authorized readers into the schools of the French counties, to see with all convenient and reasonable speed that none but authorized text books are used in these schools in other subjects. (4) Having already refused within the last few years to grant permits or new certificates to all persons unable to teach English, to continue so to do. This is the programme practically entered upon four years ago, and which I hope to carry out earnestly and kindly, not as if I were dealing with the enemies of Canada, but in the spirit in which a man should deal with his fellow-citizens who are willing to recognize the authority of the law. (Long continued cheers.) Now you will, perhaps, say there is nothing new in that. I know there is not. My contention has been all along that we had very little to learn from our critics in this matter. We may be blamed for moving slowly. Even that I do not admit. But we are certainly not to blame for neglecting entirely the public interests in these matters. (Hear, hear.) Now, having said so much on what we propose to do, let me briefly refer to what we will not do:—(1) In dealing with French and German in our public schools, we will not allow our French and German fellow-citizens

TO BE REGARDED AS ALIENS.

They are not aliens is any sense of the term. (Cheers). They may not speak our langage, but neither do many of our citizens

of Scotch descent. I must be allowed to repudiate in the strongest terms the narrow sectionalism which appears to have taken such strong hold of some people as entirely repugnant to the development of a national spirit and the unification of the people of this country. (Applause). As Anglo-Saxons we are in the majority, and we should not only be manly and chivalrous, but we should be generous as well, to this minority. It is certainly no proof of our right to supremacy to be sectional and autocratic. We shall, therefore, as a Government, deal with this question not according to the course laid out for us by designing agitators, but we trust in a calm, dispassionate and reasonable way, assuring ourselves at every step that no public interests are sacrificed or no private right ignored. (Loud applause). (2) We

SHALL NOT PROHIBIT ABSOLUTELY

the study of French or German in any school where the local wants of the population render a knowledge of these languages desirable or necessary. The policy enunciated by Mr. Craig in the House last session we do not propose to accept. (Cheers). He demanded that there should be but one language taught in our Public Schools. We think such a policy would be arbitrary and unwise. Germany has tried it in Alsace and Lorraine with doubtful effect. Russia has tried it in Poland also with doubtful effect. Our course will be after different proceedings. If the British Government can tolerate French in the Channel Islands, Welsh in Wales, Gælic in Scotland and Erse in Ireland, without endangering her institutions, we can surely allow our French and German fellow-citizens to receive instruction in the language which for social and domestic purposes, and even in some cases for business purposes, is a matter of considerable importance to them. (Hear hear). (3) We do not propose to regard our French and German fellow-citizens as barbarians and reactionary simply because they do not speak the English language as fluently as we do, or because they may not adopt in every respect the forms and customs of our race.

I MUST THEREFORE RESENT

—and I desire to do it in the strongest terms—the language used by a correspondent of The Toronto *Telegram*, in which, speaking of the Counties of Prescott and Russell, he said,

"The traveller who finds himself in this Providence-forsaken hole at evening may well pale with anxiety at the prospect of spending a night in any of the low-walled, ramshackled apologies for home which meet his gaze. If the houses themselves are not sufficiently repulsive, a glance at the inhabitants would certainly decide him in favor of taking to the woods for his lodgings.

Dirty, greasy, bleary-eyed looking specimens, they no more approach the average country people to be found in Central Ontario than South African Hottentots approach the polished types of European Civilisation. . . . The crops in the fields are remarakbly poor, owing no doubt to the ignorance of their owners with regard to the grain-producing qualities of the land. In every doorway may be seen squalid, half-naked children, whose mothers are either weeding onion beds in the garden or fishing in the nearest stream. . . . It is the land of the French, the kingdom of the garlic eaters ! "

We will not allow our opponents to assume that all this zeal for one national language is the outcome of patriotic enthusiasm for the unification of the country and the perpetuation of civil liberty. I think it requires but little penetration to see through the thin veil of hypocrisy under which all their pretentions are concealed. A few years ago Prescott, Russell and Essex were represented in the Local Legislature by Conservatives. There was no cry then of French aggression and French invasion. In nearly half these schools at that time no English was taught and few of the authorized text books were used. The teachers were not as capable of teaching English as they are now. A greater number of them came from Quebec then than now. Where were these guardians of the liberties of Ontario in those days ? In 1883, when Tory members, by virtue of the votes of the Frenchmen in these counties, sat in the Legislative Assembly, were they the champions of English schools they pretend to be to-day ? When the Government submitted to the regulations of 1885, by which substantial progress has been made for securing the introduction of English into every school, did Mr. Robillard, the Tory member for Prescott, or Mr. Sol White, the Tory member for Essex, say a word in support of the policy then instituted ? Not a word. The oracles of to-day were all silent then. Even the " son of Ontario."

THE ORPHAN LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION,

while on his eastern tour in 1886, in his speeches at Winchester Springs and at Cornwall in the immediate vicinity of this Providence-forsaken land, was mute as a " mermaid by the sounding sea." (Laughter and applause.) Now like a hungry pack of wolves they are down upon us because in a day we have not changed a condition of things which must have been well known to every one of them. So long as they received the political support of the Frenchman he was a good, intelligent, progressive citizen, but when he became a Liberal and showed his appreciation of the Mowat Government he is " a South African Hottentot and a garlic eater," his " children are half naked " and his wife takes to " weeding onion beds and fishing in the nearest stream." (Cheers and laughter.) Charming gratitude this, to say

the least of it. But I must close, no matter how inviting the theme. We have just attained our majority. The long days and years of a nascent childhood are now behind us. We exercise as a Province jurisdiction over 2,000,000 of people—as a Dominion over 5,000,000. Our natural heritage covers the northern half of this great Continent. Although not racially a homogeneous people, our population represents, in its three predominant elements, the Saxon, French, and German—the dominant nations of the world. Constitutionally we are a unit. Why should we not be one in spirit, in sentiment and everything that

PERTAINS TO NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD ?

Why should the prejudices of centuries ago be appealed to to determine the actions of to-day ? Why should the bitterness and narrowness of the past be invoked as the standard for the present? Shall it be said that citizenship in its broadest sense and with all its most valued privileges is to be enjoyed in England, in Germany, in France, in the United States, but not in Canada ? It cannot be. (Cheers.) This land of great lakes and wide prairies and overshadowing forests shall not be stunted in its growth by sectionalism, nor broken into fragments by internal jealousies, if it lies in my power or in the power of the Liberal party to prevent it. (Cheers.) The policy which I have outlined shall be carried out in its integrity. We shall not be terrorised by violent agitators nor deterred by timid or irresolute allies. (Loud applause.) We shall move as deliberately and yet as quickly as the interests involved may justify. We are confident that the people of Ontario prefer the counsel of reason and prudence to the voice of passion or prejudice. The honesty of purpose already evinced will be taken as an earnest of what is yet to be shown. On these lines we shall appeal to the people of Ontario when the proper time arrives, and will await their verdict as calmly as the "man who wraps the drapery of his couch around him and lies down to pleasant dreams." (The honorable gentleman retired to his seat amid long continued cheers.)